

if it's either you or Senator Landis, the...I guess it would fall under what you talked about with regard to conflict of interest and it says, the bill prohibits the appointment to a local board of a person employed by a child caring agency or a child placing agency. Are those the terms that are used?

SENATOR WESELY: Oh, that's already in the bill.

SENATOR HALL: That's already in?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, the committee amendments only deal with court, I thought.

SENATOR HALL: Okay, so it's part of the bill that those people would be now no longer able to serve in that capacity?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes. The original bill dealt with what you are talking about. All we do in the committee amendments is add the court conflict of interest thing.

SENATOR HALL: Maybe I should address this after the committee amendment is adopted.

SENATOR WESELY: I think so, on the base of the bill.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, to pick up the thread of concern that Senator Hall pointed out, the language of the bill does extend to the state board the language on conflict of interest that is currently in the law for local boards and there there is a statement about child caring agencies and child placement agencies. Those two phrases are defined in statute and, unfortunately, those definitions do not appear in the green copy of the bill. You can find them, however, if you have a copy of the statutes, at 71-1902, and those two terms are defined for local boards and for state boards. The purpose of the bill is two-fold. First, it is to draw for the state board the same rules of the conflict of interest that exist for local boards. And, secondly, it is to alter the composition of the state board to allow for sitting members of local boards to share in the decision making at the state board level. Why? Because there are a variety of circumstances out there. The kinds of services and court